

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,928	12/10/2003		Masakazu Fukuda	Q78869	6312
23373	7590	11/24/2004		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE	MION,	PLLC	LAUTURE, JOSEPH J		
2100 PENNS	YLVAŃ	IA AVENUE, N.W.			
SUITE 800		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON DC 20027				2810	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1 1						
Supplemental	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
/ /	10/730,928	FUKUDA, MASAKAZU				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joseph Lauture	2819				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replest fixed the provided of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS froe, cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed lays will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. INED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 J	<u>une 2004</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 June 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	or election requirement. er. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is considered.	tee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been recei u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa					
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date I Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The application has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible typographical and grammatical errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which he/she may become aware in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roza (US 6,795,001) in view of Dasgupta (US 6,529,077).

Roza teaches in figure (1) an output filter for a delta-sigma modulator, comprising: an FIR low-pass filter O_n (See line 5 of abstract) that outputs data of a delta-sigma modulator (AM) from each of a plurality of delay elements (C1, C2...Cn) cascaded, controls current from a current source I_n on the basis of each of the output data to thereby attain currents weighted according to a filter characteristic, and adds the currents to output the result (See column 10, lines 41-43).

Roza teaches the essential features of the claimed invention as set forth above except for a constant current source that provides the currents to be added, feedback resistors that perform the current-to-voltage conversion and the differential operational

Art Unit: 2819

Page 3

amplifier. However, Dasgupta teaches in figure (3): a gain compensation circuit including constant current sources (Io...I3) that provide currents that are combined to yield an output; a current-to-voltage conversion unit (VI) that perform the current-tovoltage conversion by feedback resistors RC1 and RC2 (See figure 4) of a full differential operational amplifier (OA1); an additional differential conversion operational amplifier DA₂ on the output side of the operational amplifier OAI).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Dasgupta into the system of Roza to improve system performance and reliability because that would minimize the effects of environmental factors in the system (See column 2, lines 1-3). It would have been further obvious to include such filter circuit in any data processing system where filtration needs match the filter characteristics.

Application/Control Number: 10/730,928

Art Unit: 2819

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Lauture, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1805. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday between 9:30 am and 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Tokar can be reached at (571) 272-1812. The fax number for the organization to which this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1562.

Joseph Lauture Group: 2819

Date: 11/15/2004

Page 4